

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

JUDITH MATTHEWS,

Plaintiff

v.

PROGRESSIVE DIRECT INSURANCE
COMPANY and KRISTINE MANZANO,

Defendants

Case No.: 2:24-cv-01930-APG-DJA

Order

Defendants Progressive Direct Insurance Company and Kristine Manzano removed this case from state court based on diversity jurisdiction. ECF No. 1. Their notice of removal acknowledges that plaintiff Judith Matthews and Kristine Manzano are both Nevada citizens, which would destroy diversity jurisdiction. *Id.* at 2. But they assert that Manzano is “an improper and unnecessary party to this bad-faith action.” *Id.*

Matthews has thus far not responded to Progressive’s assertion that Manzano is not a proper defendant. I cannot exercise diversity jurisdiction in this case unless there is complete diversity between the parties, “meaning that the citizenship of each plaintiff is diverse from the citizenship of each defendant.” *Demarest v. HSBC Bank USA, N.A. as Tr. for registered holders of Nomura Home Equity Loan, Inc., Asset-Backed Certificates, Series 2006-HE2*, 920 F.3d 1223, 1226 (9th Cir. 2019) (quotation omitted). Consequently, I direct the parties to address this jurisdictional issue.

I THEREFORE ORDER that by December 4, 2024, plaintiff Judith Matthews shall either (1) file a brief explaining why defendant Kristine Manzano is a proper defendant in this matter or (2) voluntarily dismiss Manzano.

1 I FURTHER ORDER that by December 18, 2024, the defendants may file a response.

2 DATED this 20th day of November, 2024.

3
4 

5 _____
6 ANDREW P. GORDON
7 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23